

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The claims currently stand restricted to Group I, claims 1-13, and Group II, claims 14-20. The Restriction Requirement is justified by the fact that the method claims do not require the second passages recited in the device claims. Although the restriction requirement is not believed to be well made, Applicant has amended the method claims to require the second passages that supposedly justify the present restriction requirement. Thus, because the ground set forth in the restriction requirement is now moot, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding restriction requirement be withdrawn and that all claims proceed to substantive examination. On the otherhand, if the Examiner believes that the application is still appropriate for restriction. Applicant invites the Examiner to make that ground(s) of record so that Applicant has an opportunity to address any new ground that might be put forward to justify a restriction requirement.

In order to be responsive, Applicants elect Group I and claims 1-13 for substantive examination. However, Applicant respectfully requests that all of the claims be examined as there is no justification of record for supporting a restriction requirement.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MB McNeil', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael B. McNeil

Reg. No: 35, 949